



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sue the same method. Use them (1) to solve difficulties which you could not be expected to solve; (2) to throw light upon that which is more or less doubtful; (3) to suggest that of which you might not have thought. Use commentaries, but do not *abuse* them.

---

**In Reference to Higher Criticism.**—The publication of Dr. Lyon's article on *The Results of Biblical Criticism* in the December STUDENT has started one or two questions in the minds of some of our readers: What is the position of THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT on this subject? If its position is a conservative one, does it do right to publish the views of those who are not so conservative? The Editor of the STUDENT appreciates the fact that these are important questions. They are the test-questions which are put to every instructor in the Old Testament department. It is true, as has often been said, that the position of no religious instructor is so delicate and difficult as that of the Professor of Hebrew in our theological seminaries. The difficulty of the position, however, varies somewhat, a greater amount of freedom being allowed in some denominations than in others. What seems necessary to be said in this connection may be classified under the head of facts and under that of conclusions which are thought to be clear in consideration of these facts.

It is a *fact* that, in Germany, every scholar, of any considerable reputation, save one, has accepted to a greater or less extent the results which Higher Criticism claims to have reached.

It is a *fact* that among these scholars, no matter what may be said to the contrary, the degree of unanimity which has been reached in reference to the more important points is, indeed, remarkable.

It is a *fact* that in England a large proportion of the most reputable clergymen and scholars, even in the denominations which pride themselves upon their strict orthodoxy, have adopted in whole or in part these views.

It is a *fact* that in America a respectable number of the most esteemed Old Testament scholars sympathize in a few cases openly, in many cases privately with these views.

It is a *fact* that just as the general view of the interpretation of important portions of Scripture, [e. g., the interpretation of Genesis i., has undergone a radical change within a quarter of a century, so that the opinion which was formerly accepted unanimously, is now treated almost with ridicule,] so the general view of the composition, authorship and literary character of certain books has, in the minds of those who have given these questions any considerable thought, become quite different.

It is a *fact* that entirely correct views as to any of these questions have not as yet been attained, nor may they be expected so long as human knowledge remains finite.

It is a *fact* that they who oppose most strenuously the claims of Higher Criticism take as representatives of that science those who hold the most extreme views. It is not right to suppose that all critics are Kuenens and Wellhausens. There are men like Delitzsch, Strack, Briggs and Curtiss, who accept to a greater or less extent these results, yet remain strictly evangelical.

It is a *fact* that the results which Higher Criticism *claims* to have reached have more in their favor than the majority of persons are willing to concede, and that

these so-called results are objected to rather on the ground of their tendency, than because of a lack of proof.

It is a *fact* that many of those who make the loudest outcry against the so-called results are, for the most part, those who have not, and indeed, can not have a clear conception of the basis on which they rest.

It is, however, a *fact* that a large portion of what are called *results*, rest upon a very uncertain foundation; that although in many cases there seems to be some plausibility in the arguments adduced, absolute proof has as yet been presented for a very inconsiderable number of these results.

It is a *fact* that even if these results, at least those of a less radical character, should be shown to be true, it is possible, while accepting them to maintain a strict view as to the general truth and inspiration of the Bible.

And now, granting these to be *facts*, we believe

1) that it is the duty of every minister of the Gospel to acquaint himself with investigations, whether the results be true or false, which are attracting so largely the attention of the church.

2) that these questions can be settled only by free and open discussion.

3) that if these results are true, we ought to know it; if they are false we ought to prove it.

4) that the places for the discussion of these questions, and for obtaining a knowledge of the facts in the case are (1) the lecture-room of the theological seminary, and (2) the pages of professional journals. The weekly religious paper, read by every member of the family, is, of course, no place for the publication of such views. But a journal published in the interest of Old Testament study, aiming to present the current discussions of the day, circulating almost exclusively among ministers and the higher class of laymen, such a journal furnishes certainly the best, and indeed, the only medium for presenting and refuting these views.

5) that in no way can a greater mistake be made, supposing the conclusions to be absolutely false, than by prohibiting all presentation of such conclusions.

6) that, whatever may be the outcome of this discussion, it can only result in benefit to biblical study, and in more firmly establishing the authenticity and credibility of the Sacred Scriptures.

In the Prospectus, published in the first number of the *STUDENT*, there appeared the following notice:—

“In its attitude towards ‘new theories,’ the Journal will be conservative. Judicious discussion of questions of criticism will be encouraged, but in no case will the editor be responsible for views expressed by contributors.”

Up to this time there has occurred nothing to occasion any change of policy, nor has anything appeared in the Journal, contrary to the spirit of this announcement.